UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,623	07/24/2002	Josef Laumen	10191/2377	1416

26646 7590 06/19/2003

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER
CORSARO, NICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	7

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/089,623	LAUMEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nick Corsaro	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *07/24/* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 July 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *0724/2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 04/01/2002 has been received and placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 15-18, 23, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schwartz et al. (6,473,609).

Consider claim 15, Schwartz teaches a method for transmitting messages between at least one main station (104, figure 1) and a terminal (106) via a telecommunications network (102) (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 3 lines 37-55, col. 5 lines 8-47, col.7 lines 47-67, where Schwartz is discussing a mobile terminal with access to an internet server, the internet server being a main

station). Schwartz teaches providing a matching device (114) between the at least one main station and the terminal (see col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 5 lines 8-26, col. 7 lines 9-28, col. 7 lines 47-67, where Schwartz discusses that the link server acts as the protocol matching device between the wireless network and the internet). Schwartz teaches controlling a message exchange using the matching device, the message exchange being controlled in dependence upon at least one input from one of, the terminal, and the at least one main station (see col. 3 lines 38-55, col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 7 lines 55-62, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 29-41, col. 10 lines 35-53, col. 11 lines 4-9, col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 13 lines 64-66, col. 14 lines 10-58 where in reference to figures 6-7, Schwartz discusses the user makes inputs from the terminal to the link server, i.e., the matching device, to get data from different network servers by sending a URL of the desired server, therefore, dependent upon the input from the mobile the link server gets various forms of data from the network).

Consider claim 16, Schwartz teaches matching, by a matching device, at least one characteristic for transmission of a message to the at least one input (see col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 1-8, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 10 lines 3-8, col. 11 lines 15-35, where Schwartz discusses based on the request for communication and the inputs from the user of the terminal, i.e., the inputs sent to the link server as a URL and device characteristics, the link server retrieves a specified type of data from the network server, formats the data for transmission to the mobile terminal and display on the mobile).

Consider claim 17, Schwartz teaches the at least one characteristic is at least one of a data type, a data format and a transmission mode (see col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 1-8, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 10 lines 3-8, col. 11 lines 15-35, where Schwartz discusses receiving a URL

specifying a server and formatting the message according to the device characteristics, sent or inputted to the link server at the start of a communication).

Consider claim 18, Schwartz teaches converting, by the matching device, messages from the at least one main station into a standardized form readable by the terminal; and transmitting the converted messages to the terminal (see col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 10 lines 3-16, col. 15 lines 39-65, col. 16 lines 30-65 and col. 19 lines 1-17, where Schwartz discusses changing the file to SDD format to send to the terminal in more efficiently).

Consider claim 23, Schwartz teaches inputting by a user of the terminal the at least one input from the terminal in the form of a data record; and transmitting the data record to the matching device (see col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 39-65, col. 16 lines 30-65, col. 18 lines 11-16, col. 19 lines 18-67 and col. 20 lines 1-31, where Schwartz discusses each request/input is actually composed of several fields, therefore a record, where the message is a URL specifying server with a particular type of information).

Consider claim 28, Schwartz teaches using protocols in the terminal and the matching device which include functional elements for a predefined transmission mode for the transmission of a message; and effecting a suitable signaling of the message for the terminal (see col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 4 lines 1-9, col. 7 lines 1-21, col. 9 lines 29-67, col. 10 lines 3-8, and col. 11 lines 18-33, where, as shown in figure 3A , 3B, and 6 Schwartz discusses upon starting the session the mobile exchanges characteristic data with the link server and the server changing the data format for transmission to the mobile, and the link server makes the protocol conversion).

Consider claim 29, Schwartz teaches a matching device (114, figure 1) for a transmitting messages between at least one main station (104) and terminal (106) via a telecommunications network (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 3 lines 37-61, col. 5 lines 8-61, col. 7 lines 47-67, and col. 8 lines 46-67, where Schwartz discusses the transmission of messages between a network server, i.e., main station, and a mobile terminal via a link server that converts the messages to useable formats, between the devices, therefore, matching formats). Schwartz teaches at least one interface (302, figure 3A) to the at least one main station; an interface (306) to the terminal (see col. 6 lines 65-67, col. 7 lines 1-27, and col. 5 lines 8-26). Schwartz teaches a storage device (316, figure 3A) configured to store at least one input from one of the terminal and the at least one main station for controlling a message exchange between the at least one main station and the terminal (see col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 15-41, col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 18 lines 11-16, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 19 lines 1-45, where Schwartz discusses a message exchange processor and memory for processing the requests and data exchanges). Schwartz teaches a control unit (315, figure 3A) configured to control the message exchange as a function of the at least one input (see col. 8 lines 46-67, col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 15-41, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 19 lines 1-48, where Schwartz discusses the user of the terminal inputs commands corresponding to URL's to access data in different network server that are processed by the message processor).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz et al. (6,473,609) in view of Boyle et al. (6,138,158).

Consider claim 19, Schwartz discloses notifying the matching device of an incoming message for the terminal, by at least one main station (see col. 18 lines 11-43, where Schwartz discusses network server sending a message directed toward a particular terminal). Schwartz discloses if the terminal can be reached, initiating a transmission process for the message to the terminal, according to one of a push transmission and a pull transmission mode (see col. 18 lines 44-67, col. 19 lines 1-18, col. 12 lines 54-67, col. 8 lines 45-67, and col. 9 lines 15-40, where Schwartz discusses that the messages can be pushed or pulled by the mobile terminal or network server).

Schwartz discloses checking terminal availability (col. 18 lines 43-50), but does not specifically disclose if the terminal cannot be reached, storing the message until the matching device recognizes that the terminal can be reached. Boyle teaches if the terminal cannot be reached, storing the message until the matching device recognizes that the terminal can be reached (see col. 11 lines 24-50, col. 12 lines 24-31, col. 4 lines 58-67, and col. 5 lines 36-45, where Boyle queues messages destine for mobile and sends them when the mobile is available).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and when sending a message, if the terminal cannot be reached, storing the message until the matching device recognizes that the terminal can be reached, as taught by Boyle, thus allowing users to be timely and periodically informed of messages to be delivered when the user becomes available, as discussed by Boyle (col. 1 lines 41-46, col. 1 lines 55-60, col. 12 lines 28-31).

Consider claim 20, Schwartz discloses transmitting directly to the terminal, as a function of the input from the terminal a message for the terminal present in the at least one main station by the matching device when the terminal can be reached (see col. 8 lines 46-67, col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 10 lines 35-54,col. 11 lines 15-53, col. 12 lines 31-65, col. 13 lines 25-37, col. 18 lines 11-67 and col.19 lines 1-17, and col. 20 lines 18-61, where Schwartz discusses that upon initiation of a communication session as a function of user input data is fetched and a message notification is sent and data downloaded).

Schwartz discloses the terminal may not be available (col. 18 lines 42-56), but does not specifically disclose notifying the terminal of the availability of the message by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached. Boyle teaches notifying the terminal of the availability of the message by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached (see col. 12 lines 23-43, and col. 11 lines 30-50, where Boyle discusses queuing messages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and when delivering messages, notifying the terminal of the availability of the message by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached, as taught by Boyle, thus allowing the user to be timely and periodically informed of

messages to be delivered when the user becomes available, as discussed by Boyle (col. 1 lines 41-47, col. 1 lines 55-60, col. 12 lines 28-31).

Consider claim 22, Schwartz discloses converting the message to a form usable by the terminal and sending to the terminal as function of the an input at the terminal as a function of input by the terminal (see col. 7 lines 9-21, col. 8 lines 17-32, col. 8 lines 44-67, col. 9 lines 15-40 and col. 10 lines 3-35, where, as shown in figure 3B, Schwartz discusses a user request and response with data type and the link server converts the message to the protocol used by the terminal based on terminal characteristics).

Schwartz does not specifically disclose segmenting, by the matching device as a function of the input from the terminal individual parts of a message, which includes a plurality of elements, and processing the message by the matching device. Boyle teaches segmenting, by the matching device as a function of the input from the terminal individual parts of a message, which includes a plurality of elements and processing the message by the matching device (see col. 13 lines 35-54, where Boyle discusses that if the air interface is one that does not support an extremely long message, the message is segmented and sent in several messages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and segment, by the matching device as a function of the input from the terminal individual parts of a message which includes a plurality of elements and processing the message by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached, as taught by Boyle, thus when the air interface is narrow band, allowing messages to be conformed to that protocol used by the device, as discussed by Boyle (col. 2 lines 43-50, col. 12 lines 37-44).

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz (A) et al. (6,473,609) in view of Schwartz (B) (6,243,739).

Consider claim 21, Schwartz (A) discloses transmitting messages from servers, i.e., main stations, to a mobile terminal device (see col. 18 lines 1-67, and col. 19 lines 1-17).

Schwartz (A) does not specifically disclose transmitting a plurality of messages, from different ones of the at least one main station, in a combined form to the terminal by the matching device. Schwartz (B) teaches transmitting a plurality of messages, from different ones of the at least one main station, in a combined form to the terminal by the matching device (see col. 10 lines 55-67, and col. 11 lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz (A) , and transmit a plurality of messages, from different ones of the at least one main station, in a combined form to the terminal by the matching device, as taught by Schwartz (B), thereby reducing delays in communicating messages to subscribers, as discussed by Schwartz (B), (col. 2 lines 42-59).

1. Claim 24-27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz et al. (6,473,609) in view of Smethers et al. (6,560,640).

Consider claim 24, Schwartz discloses inputting by a user of the terminal a plurality of different a data records for various functionalities that are implement-able by the terminal (see col. 9 lines 15-20, col. 19 lines 18-67 and col. 20 lines 1-31, where Schwartz discusses the message from the terminal are one or more URL requests where each request is actually composed of several fields, i.e., a record, where requests are to access different servers for different functions of the terminal, such as stock or news etc..).

Schwartz does not specifically disclose storing the plurality of different data records in storage device assigned to the matching device. Smethers teaches storing the plurality of different data records in storage device assigned to the matching device (see col. 8 lines 1-57, where Smethers discusses that a user can create a bookmark for the URL and store it at the server, the bookmark being a URL and associated data, with marked with a shortened identifier).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and store the plurality of different data records in storage device assigned to the matching device, as taught by Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Consider claim 25, Schwartz discloses each of the plurality of different data records has an assigned URL (see col. 19 lines 18-67).

Schwartz does not specifically disclose each of the plurality of different data records has an assigned identifier. Smethers teaches each of the plurality of different data records has an assigned identifier (see col. 8 lines 25-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and have each of the plurality of different data records have an assigned identifier, as taught by Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Consider claim 26, Schwartz discloses a user making inputs to access servers; where the input is a data record having a URL and other identifiers (see col. 19 lines 17-65).

Schwartz does not specifically disclose selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of different data records; transmitting the assigned identifying character of the selected data record from the terminal to the matching device; checking, in the matching device, whether a data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device; and if the data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device, selecting, by the matching device, the data record. Smethers teaches selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of different data records; transmitting the assigned identifying character of the selected data record from the terminal to the matching device (see col. 8 lines 37-47). Smethers teaches checking, in the matching device, whether a data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device; and if the data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device, selecting, by the matching device, the data record (see col. 8 lines 48-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and incorporate selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of different data records; transmitting the assigned identifying character of the selected data record from the terminal to the matching device; checking, in the matching device, whether a data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device; and if the data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device, selecting, by the matching device, the data record , as taught by Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Consider claim 27, Schwartz discloses a user making inputs to access servers; where the input is a data record having a URL and other identifiers (see col. 19 lines 17-65).

Schwartz does not specifically disclose numbering the plurality of different data records in a sequence in which they are stored in the storage device, identifying characters of each of the plurality of data records being formed from the numbering. Smethers teaches numbering the plurality of different data records in a sequence in which they are stored in the storage device, identifying characters of each of the plurality of data records being formed from the numbering (see col. 12 lines 1-31 col. 13 lines 41-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and number the plurality of different data records in a sequence in which they are stored in the storage device, identifying characters of each of the plurality of data records being formed from the numbering, as taught by Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(6,466,783), Dahm discloses a visual interface for client server operations of a mobile device, however, is only discussing the interface in detail and not system infrastructure in detail.

(5895471), King is discussing book marking in mobile computing, however is not discussing the storage of the bookmarks in detail.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Nick Corsaro at telephone number (703) 306-5616.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung (acting supervisor), can be reached at (703) 308-7745. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth, Floor (Receptionist). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Nick Corsaro